



CREST DRIVE COMMUNITY TEAM CSS PROCESS MEETING SUMMARY

City of Eugene
858 Pearl St 3rd Floor
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-5727
(541) 682-5598 FAX

Introduction

This memo provides a recap of the first CDCT Context Sensitive Solutions meeting following the previous three process training meetings. It was held on Thursday April 20th, at the Washington Park Community Center. Margot Helphand facilitated the meeting. CDCT committee members present are recorded on the attached attendance sheet (pg 5).

Because this was the first CDCT meeting following the process training workshops facilitated by Josh Reckord and Bill Kentta, Margot developed a transitional meeting agenda based on a proposed agenda prepared by Josh and Bill. This two-meeting agenda covered items necessary for the CDCT to move forward with a new facilitator and provided time to firm up any final procedural and group agreements. The agenda follows with highlighted sections covered in the April 20th meeting:

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Communication Agreements**
 - a. Breakout groups: Deposits and withdrawals of trust**
- 3. Roles**
- 4. CDCT Mission**
 - a. Why do we exist?**
 - b. What does success look like?**
- 5. Meeting Schedule**
- 6. CDCT Work Plan**

Introductions

Margot began the meeting by introducing herself to the group, with the group following. She then explained that dividing Josh and Bill's proposed transitional agenda into two separate meetings was necessary to provide ample time to cover all of the items. The CDCT expressed support for the proposed agenda topics for forthcoming meetings.

Prior to discussing communication agreements, Margot first stressed the importance of keeping meeting topics and discussion within the meeting, rather than outside of the meeting and among a few individuals. This helps ensure a trusting and open environment of communication. Second, she noted that each participant, including herself, should assume good intentions from other members. This is critical, given the amount of time and effort members have spent thus far on the process.

Communication Agreements

Margot suggested that the committee would build and maintain trust by agreeing on and holding to a set of communication agreements as part of the larger group agreements. She used the "bank account" analogy of deposits and withdrawals to describe trust building and trust depleting behaviors. A conversation followed this description when a participant questioned the need for process agreements. Most of the participants agreed that building trust was a universal task and that completing a comprehensive set of group agreements, while more time consuming initially, would pay off in the long

run. The discussion also included talk of the group's role of communicating ideas and comments from the neighborhood it represents.

Immediately following this discussion, the CDCT split into groups of approximately three members each to describe trust building and trust depleting behaviors (deposits and withdrawals). Identified behaviors follow.

Deposits

- Open & transparent communication
- Openness in & out of the CDCT
- Full disclosure/transparency
- Straight, non-ambiguous answers
- Providing complete information
- Checking facts from source before responding
- Not to ascribe motives to information
- No contradictory information
- Everyone on the same page
- Adhered to agreements
- Dependability
- Not acting until the group is on board
- Flexible timeline to allow issues to be resolved
- Known agenda within agreed time frame
- Timely agendas
- Consistency- not changing position or reasons for position
- Respectful listening
- Attention to issues
- Clear, harmonious decision-making

Withdrawals

- Influence process from outside (not within the CDCT)
- Contradictions
- Acting unilaterally
- Withholding vital information from those involved
- Hidden agendas, discussion outside of meetings
- Concealing information
- Allowing timeline to drive process
- Hostility
- Presumptions made in statements- "Standards are inflexible"

Those behaviors identified as deposits were suggested as those that would be captured and framed in the communication agreements, whereas those identified as withdrawals were those the CDCT would avoid. During this discussion, participants raised the issue of airtime for questions. Margot suggested dedicating a specific allotted amount of time for Q&A during meetings. Concurrently, participants discussed email etiquette and appropriate use for the CDCT.

Following a discussion of the deposits and withdrawals, the group summarized key points to be reflected in the group agreements. These included:

- Communication will be open, honest, and transparent and reflect a "no surprises" policy
- Members will listen to each other respectfully and assume good intentions
- Questions arising about the process should be first directed to the CDCT for resolution

Key points of discussion on email included the following:

- Log email Q&A to discuss at meetings
- Try to bring questions before the group during scheduled meetings rather than by emailing them
- Use email at a minimum, don't overuse
- Email Margot with clarifying or procedural questions

At the conclusion of this discussion, Margot surveyed the committee for support on the following three items:

1. Should we use a "parking lot" or "issue bin" for questions to be answered at the appropriate time?
2. Should we include an agenda item for questions brought to the group?
3. Use email sparingly and only for burning questions so no one is excluded from discussions and questions of relevance to the whole group.

Each item above received full support from the CDCT.

Discussion of communication agreements spurred another conversation relating to City Staff job requirements and administrative responsibilities regarding communication to elected officials and to the public. The CDCT discussed how the group would communicate with City Council and the media. Questions surrounded the scheduling of the upcoming council work session on May 8th where City Staff will provide an update of the Crest Drive CSS Process. Staff noted that the City Council work session will provide information on CDCT process thus far and will inform councilors of the process as described on the City's CDCT website. Ultimately, the CDCT agreed that working within the communication agreements would allow City Staff to fulfill its professional responsibilities while promoting a climate of trust within the group. The group also discussed media coverage on the process that occurred earlier in the week, with the media contact by CDCT members, both from the neighborhood and staff as "trust deposits." It was further discussed that the group may want to consider appointing a designated spokesperson or spokespeople to respond to future media contacts.

By operating under the communication agreements, members of the CDCT will not require micro-management when sharing information to and from the group. At the conclusion of this discussion, Margot surveyed the committee for support on the following item:

1. Should City Staff notify the CDCT anytime the CDCT is on the city council agenda?
2. To enhance trust among CDCT members, each is responsible to:
 - a. Not misrepresent the CDCT process,
 - b. "Stick to the script", and
 - c. Implement a mechanism for approval of public minutes.

Each item above received full support from the CDCT

Discussion: Project Budget, Alternates, and Miscellaneous Questions

Before reaching the agenda items on roles and meeting schedules, several brief items were discussed by the CDCT. The first surrounded project costs and budgeting. Mark Schoening explained the budget development process, including details on how the Crest Drive CSS Process budget request was developed and submitted for the FY07 proposed budget.

The CDCT asked City Staff whether the City of Eugene planned to ask for money at the May 8th council work session. City Staff replied that the \$240,000 budget request amount for this project was developed in Nov/Dec of 2005. The CSS budget request was forwarded to the City of Eugene Executive Team, and was included in the proposed budget to be forwarded for consideration by the budget committee, and ultimately the City Council. It will be part of the City Manager's FY07 Budget Message delivered to the City Budget Committee on April 24, 2006. The Budget Committee review process will occur the first two weeks of May.

Participants then asked whether a Local Improvement District (LID) would be formed in the Crest Neighborhood to cover project costs. City Staff responded that an LID would only form if the CSS process proves successful and a decision to move forward with actual construction occurs. The LID would only cover normal project costs, including engineering and design costs, but would exclude the CSS facilitation and public involvement process costs.

Several miscellaneous questions followed:

- Who is Lisa Gardner's alternate?
 - Another City Staff person.
- Can we bring in an outside CSS expert?
 - We can answer that question when we develop the work plan.
- What if all the CDCT members decide to vote against the City's agenda?
 - City Staff are voting members of the CDCT. This is a consensus building process. There are no other hidden processes where the City would have another agenda. Ultimately, the CDCT will bring City Council a recommendation and they will make the final decision.

With limited time left for other agenda items, Margot suggested the committee move to the next item. In closing the previous discussion, the CDCT directed City Staff to work with Margot to revise the draft group agreements to include the communication agreement elements developed during tonight's meeting.

Roles

Margot's role as facilitator is to move the group forward and to ensure that agreed upon ground rules are followed by each member of the CDCT. She is also there to provide clarification on CDCT member roles. The committee began asking clarifying questions about alternates. After some discussion, Margot suggested the group start by following the group agreements already developed regarding alternates.

Meeting Schedule

Margot presented a revised meeting schedule for the CDCT process. Prior to her hire as the CSS process facilitator, the CDCT agreed to schedule 2-hour meetings every two weeks. Due to scheduling conflicts, Margot proposed a revised schedule to better reflect her availability through September 2006, and to match the anticipated work plan pace during the summer months. All meetings are scheduled on Thursdays from 7 to 9 PM on the following dates:

May 4

May 25 (location TBD)

June 15

July 6 or July 13th, based on Margot polling the group for availability – location TBD

August 17

September 14.

Except where noted, all meetings are confirmed for Washington Park.

After some discussion, the group agreed to follow the modified meeting schedule and to allow for further changes to accommodate the work plan.

Next Meeting Agenda Items

- Finalize group agreements
- Develop mission statement (Homework for CDCT- come prepared to discuss the CDCT *purpose* and its *deliverables*)
- Work plan development using a clean slate and brainstorming session

Additional Questions or Comments

In closing, CDCT members provided further questions and comments:

- Introductions should include everyone.
- Will 12 hours of meetings be sufficient since we have already spent 9?
 - The work plan should help dictate a meeting schedule.
- Ground rules are critical for success.
- Is there a City timeline?
 - Not a specific deadline-driven timeline, however the longer this process draws out; the more likely there may be diminishing returns, including drop-off in participation of CDCT members. The city is committed to taking the “right amount of time” to complete the process while maintaining an effective and productive CDCT CSS process.
- How do we know if people are committed to the process?
 - We’ll deal with that question as it comes up during the process.

Name	Phone	19-Apr
Calciano, Frank	541-485-3680	✓
Farkas, Paul	541-485-0859	
Gardner, Lisa	541-682-5378	✓
Gryc, Tina	541-345-2281	✓
Hawley, Sherie	541-913-2730	
Hecker, Steven	541-954-1161	
Huestis, Hal	541-345-7286	✓
Jacobson, Cris	541-344-9924	✓
Lorish, Fred	541-341-3993	
McDonald, James	541-683-6027	✓
Neet, Don	541-687-0792	
Reed, Jim	541-344-7985	✓
Rowland, Mary	541-345-4195	✓
Rude, John	541-342-6427	✓
Schoening, Mark	541-682-5243	✓
Starling, Ginny	541-683-2512	✓
Stewart-Smith, Meg	541-913-5464	✓
Treadway, Cathryn	541-689-7410	✓
Verrijt, Francina	541-344-3735	✓
West, Steve	541-344-9347	✓
Wilken, Lyndell	541-343-3080	
*Bayley, Carmen	541-345-7286	✓
*Donahue, Christine	541-683-8220	✓
*Nielson, Clyde		✓
*O'Brien, Kim	541-485-3533	
*Saranpa, Kathy	541-687-7199	✓
*Farkas, Virginia	541-485-0859	✓
*Alternates		